## **United States Court of Appeals FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

\_\_\_\_\_

	No. 03-3198	
United States of America,	* *	
Appellee,	*	
	* Appeal from the	ne United States
v.	* District Court	for the
	* Northern Distr	ict of Iowa.
Juan Medina-Viedma,	*	
	* [UNPUBI	LISHED]
Appellant.	*	_
	Submitted: May 7, 2004	
	Filed: May 12, 2004	
Defere DVE MeMILLIAN	, and RILEY, Circuit Judges.	
Defore D I E. MCMILLIAN	. and Killer. Cheun juuges.	

Before BYE, McMILLIAN, and RILEY, Circuit Judges.

\_\_\_\_\_

## PER CURIAM.

Juan Medina-Viedma (Medina-Viedma) appeals the 71-month sentence the district court<sup>1</sup> imposed after he pled guilty to illegal reentry after deportation following a conviction for an aggravated felony, in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a) and (b)(2) (2000). Medina-Viedma's counsel moved to withdraw and filed a brief under Anders v. California, 386 U.S.738 (1967).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The Honorable Linda R. Reade, United States District Judge for the Northern District of Iowa.

On appeal, counsel argues the sentence imposed was too harsh and the district court failed to state a reason for imposing a sentence at the top of the Guidelines range. These arguments fail. Medina-Viedma's sentence falls within 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b)(2)'s 20-year maximum, it is within the appropriate Guidelines range, and we will not review the sentence merely because it is at the top of the range, see United States v. Woodrum, 959 F.2d 100, 101 (8th Cir. 1992), and the district court was not required to state its reasons for imposing a sentence at a particular point within the Guidelines range (57 to 71 months), cf. 18 U.S.C. § 3553(c)(1) (requiring sentencing court to state reasons for imposing sentence at particular point within Guidelines range where range exceeds 24 months).

After reviewing the record independently under <u>Penson v. Ohio</u>, 488 U.S. 75 (1988), we find no nonfrivolous issues. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment, and grant counsel's motion to withdraw.